



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/858,035	05/15/2001	Tarun J. Edwin	297912001911	4383

7590                    10/01/2002

Todd W. Wight  
Morrison & Foerster LLP  
555 West Fifth Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90013-1024

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

PREBILIC, PAUL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3738	

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/858,035	EDWIN ET AL.
	Examiner Paul B. Prebilic	Art Unit 3738
-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --		
<b>Period for Reply</b>		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.</li> <li>- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).</li> <li>- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</li> </ul>		
<b>Status</b>		
<p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 May 2001</u>.</p> <p>2a)<input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL.      2b)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</p>		
<b>Disposition of Claims</b>		
<p>4)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>33-40</u> is/are pending in the application.</p> <p>4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.</p> <p>6)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>33-40</u> is/are rejected.</p> <p>7)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.</p> <p>8)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</p>		
<b>Application Papers</b>		
<p>9)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>10)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on <u>15 May 2001</u> is/are: a)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> accepted or b)<input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).</p>		
<p>11)<input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)<input type="checkbox"/> approved b)<input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.</p>		
12) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		
<b>Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120</b>		
<p>13)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</p> <p>a)<input type="checkbox"/> All b)<input type="checkbox"/> Some * c)<input type="checkbox"/> None of:</p> <p>1.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</p> <p>2.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.</p> <p>3.<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</p>		
<p>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</p>		
<p>14)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).</p> <p>a)<input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.</p>		
15) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.		
<b>Attachment(s)</b>		
<p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u>.</p> <p>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>		

Art Unit: 3738

***Specification***

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is not directed to the presently claimed invention. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The current status of all parent applications is not updated in the continuing data. Applicants are respectfully requested to update the status of each parent application in response to this Office action.

On page 6, line 27, "withy" is a misspelling.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Drawings***

The drawings filed May 15, 2001 have been approved by the Examiner.

***Oath/Declaration***

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

Non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations have been made to the oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.52(c).

The copy of the declaration appears defective because uninitialed alterations were made to it. In particular, the citizenship of one inventor was crossed out and replaced with a written form of "India."

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3738

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

- (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
- (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

Claims 33 and 35-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Inoue (US 5,676,671) wherein the tensile sheet is seamless since no seam is shown or disclosed; see Figures 1, 11, and 12. Note that some of the wires are cladded; see Figure 2, column 3, lines 21-33 and column 8, lines 3-8.

With regard to claim 38, the cover can be coated with collagen; see column 7, lines 49-61.

With regard to claim 37, the nickel-titanium alloy has to be in its austenitic state since it is elastic. The martisitic state of the alloy is not elastic and would not elastically deform as set forth in Inoue.

With regard to claim 40, when the catheter (8) is the substrate, then the claim language is met; see Figure 23.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 33-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bley et al (US 5,674,241) in view of Wiktor (US 4,886,062) or Tu et al (US 4,816,339).

Bley discloses a stent, which can be in many shapes and sizes and enclosed around substrates; see the whole document and especially Figures 6 and 8-11 for the various stents disclosed. However, Bley does not specifically disclose a cladded stent or a seamless substrate as claimed. However, Wiktor teaches that coiled polyester coated or cladded stents were known to the art (see column 4, line 52 et seq) and Tu et al teaches that seamless expandable grafts of extruded expanded PTFE were known to the art (see the entire document). Therefore, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to use the stent of Wiktor as the stent of Bley and the grafts of Tu et al for the substrates of Bley for the same reasons that Wiktor and Tu et al use the same.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant should specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure, including the claims (MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06). Due to the procedure outlined in MPEP 2163.06 for interpreting claims, it is noted that other art may be applicable under 35 USC 102 or 35 USC 103(a) once the aforementioned issue(s) is/are addressed.

Applicant is respectfully requested to provide a list of all copending applications that set forth similar subject matter to the present claims. A copy of such copending claims is respectfully requested in response to this Office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Prebilic whose telephone number is (703) 308-2905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott, can be reached on (703) 308-2111. The fax phone number for this Technology Center is (703) 872-9301.

Art Unit: 3738

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 3700 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.



Paul Prebilic  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3738